

Appendix H – Appropriate Monument Uses

Public uses on national wildlife refuges are considered ‘closed’ until specifically opened. Opening such uses is a two-part process. First, the proposed use must be determined to be an “appropriate use” of the refuge. Second, if a use is found to be appropriate, then it must be found to be compatible with the purposes of the refuge (see Appendix I) in order to be allowed. Compatibility determinations do not need to be developed for uses found to be not appropriate.

Under the FWS Appropriate Refuges Uses policy (601 FW 1), there are nine categories of refuge uses and activities which are found to be appropriate or otherwise exempt from the requirement for evaluation of appropriateness. These are:

- 1) Situations where the FWS does not have adequate jurisdiction to prohibit a use.
- 2) The exercise of reserved rights, treaty rights by Native Americans, or other situations where legal mandates state FWS-NWRS must allow certain uses.
- 3) Refuge management activities, not including refuge management “economic” activities (see 603 FW 2.6 N.).
- 4) Wildlife-dependent public uses—hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation.
- 5) The take of fish and wildlife regulated by a state (e.g., through fishing, hunting, and trapping).
- 6) Authorized military activities that directly benefit refuge purposes.
- 7) Uses which have already been described in a refuge CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.
- 8) Uses which contribute to fulfilling the NWRS mission, or refuge purpose(s), goals, or objectives which are described in a refuge management plan approved after October 9, 1997.
- 9) State fish and wildlife agency activities which have been documented to directly contribute to achievement of refuge purpose(s), goals, and the NWRS mission; are addressed in a CCP or formal agreement; or are approved under national policy.

This appendix provides the FWS’s appropriateness review for uses identified by some portion of the public as being desirable on the Monument. With few exceptions (below), the refuge manager must decide if a new or existing use is appropriate. In assessing whether a secondary use is appropriate, the refuge manager must evaluate the following ten factors (the letters correspond to the evaluation criteria in the Appropriate Uses form):

- a) Does the FWS have jurisdiction over the use? If the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use or the area where the use would occur, then there is no authority to consider the use.
- b) Does the use comply with all applicable laws and regulations? The proposed use must be consistent with all applicable laws and regulations (e.g., federal, state, tribal and local). Uses prohibited by law are not appropriate.
- c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Department and FWS policies? If the proposed use conflicts with an applicable Executive Order or Department or Service policy, the use is not appropriate.
- d) Is the use consistent with public safety? If the proposed use creates an unreasonable level of risk to visitors or staff, or if the use requires staff to take unusual safety precautions to assure the safety of the public or refuge staff, the use is not appropriate.
- e) Is the use consistent with refuge goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? Refuge goals and objectives are designed to guide management toward achieving refuge purpose(s). Goals and objectives for the Monument are defined in Chapter 2 of the CCP.¹⁹³ If the proposed use, either itself or in combination with other uses or activities, conflicts with a refuge goal, objective, or management strategy, the use is generally not appropriate.
- f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed? If the use was already considered and rejected as not appropriate, then it should not further unless circumstances or conditions have changed significantly.
- g) For uses other than wildlife-dependent recreational uses, is the use manageable with available budget and staff? If a proposed use diverts management efforts or resources away from proper, reasonable management of a refuge activity or wildlife-dependent recreational use, the use is generally not appropriate.
- h) Will the use be manageable in the future within existing resources? If the use would lead to recurring requests for the same or similar activities that will be difficult to manage in the future, then the use is not appropriate.
- i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the refuge's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources? If not, then the use will generally not be further considered.

¹⁹³ Refuges may also rely on goals and objectives found in comprehensive management plans or refuge master plans developed prior to passage of the Improvement Act, as long as these goals and objectives comply with the tenets and directives of the Improvement Act.

- j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality, compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future? If not, the use is generally not further considered.

If an existing use is found to be not appropriate, the refuge manager must eliminate or modify the use as expeditiously as practicable. If a proposed new use is not appropriate, the refuge manager must deny the use (601 FW 1.3).

Rationale

As Monument staff developed the Appropriate Uses findings, it became apparent that the assumptions and ideas that went into the process should be documented. The following is not a full representation of the hours of discussions and research that went into the appropriateness use evaluation process, but it does identify the key concepts involved in the findings.

- 1) The most common or traditional application of the use was addressed. For example, geocaching typically involves the leaving or taking of an item as part of the activity. Participants in field dog trials in the area like to use horses. Etc. These common uses will be addressed individually below.
- 2) The answer to Decision Criteria E was, in all instances, “no.” This was based on the fact that the Monument designation is a recent event, and as such, it has never had an “approved” management plan. However, the fact that the Monument does not yet have an approved management plan was not a factor in making appropriateness findings for the Monument.
- 3) Several activities were broken into different parts for the sake of clarity. For example, camping, when considered as a whole, was not an appropriate use of the Monument with the current resources available. However, limited camping along the river to ensure public safety is possible with existing or reasonably foreseeable resources. Splitting these activities into two different appropriate use analyses provided for a clear picture of what was appropriate and possible.
- 4) The analysis for biking on roads was limited to roads directly under the control, management and maintenance of the FWS. County and state roads (e.g., State Route 24), even though within the Monument, were not considered as part of the appropriateness evaluation as the FWS does not have jurisdiction over these roads.
- 5) Biking on specially constructed and/or designated trails was determined not be an appropriate use due to the Monument Proclamation and accompanying implementation paper from the White House. Those documents “. . . prohibits motorized and mechanized vehicle travel off road . . .” The FWS has interpreted this to include trails; that is, trail use

is considered an “off road” use. This is consistent with final rules established by the USFS on November 9, 2005 (FR 70, 216, pages 68263-91; 36 CFR Parts 212, 251, 261 and 295), whereby a road is defined as “a motor vehicle route over 50 inches wide” and a trail is “a route 50 inches or less in width or a route over 50 inches wide that is identified and managed as a trail.” The FWS may dually designate some existing roads as trails, in which case, biking on the ‘trail’ would be allowed.

- 6) Camping—other than for floatboating—was defined as needing at least minimal facilities and maintenance, such as sanitation, fire protection, site hardening, garbage removal, and toilet pumping. The appropriate use analysis was based on these minimum facilities and not on specialized facilities, such as recreational vehicle hookups, showers, etc.
- 7) Floatboat camping was defined on a pack-it-in, pack-it-out basis with no open flames allowed. All camping would be at a minimum number of defined and hardened sites distributed through a lottery system.
- 8) The analysis for field dog trials was based on past activities on the Monument. These previous field dog trials involved camping, the use of horses, cooking, and overnight horse tie-ups.
- 9) As mentioned, geocaching was defined as the taking or leaving of objects, which is inconsistent with FWS policy.
- 10) Hang gliding is not consistent with airspace restrictions over the Hanford Site.
- 11) The cost to repair damage from cross-country horseback use (see the compatibility determination for horseback riding) was determined to be unmanageable with current staff and budgetary resources.
- 12) Since the use of the observatory on the Monument is not within the jurisdiction of the FWS at this time, it was not evaluated for appropriateness. Should jurisdiction change in the future, the use will be reassessed for its appropriateness. The FWS has addressed the observatory in a variety of sections throughout the CCP (e.g., 2.10.2.11 Objective 1-11: Restoration of Lithosol Habitat).

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument¹⁹⁴

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Biking, FWS-Managed Public Roads

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ¹⁹⁵	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

¹⁹⁴ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

¹⁹⁵ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____ No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate ____ Appropriate X

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument¹⁹⁶

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Biking, Trails

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?	✓	
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ¹⁹⁷	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?	✓	
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?	✓	
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

¹⁹⁶ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

¹⁹⁷ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X

Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument¹⁹⁸

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Camping, Floatboat

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ¹⁹⁹	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

¹⁹⁸ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

¹⁹⁹ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____ No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate ____ Appropriate X

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²⁰⁰

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Camping, Other Than Floatboating

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²⁰¹	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?	✓	
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?	✓	
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²⁰⁰ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²⁰¹ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X

Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²⁰²

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Dog Walking

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²⁰³	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?	✓	
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?	✓	

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²⁰² This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²⁰³ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X

Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²⁰⁴

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Field Dog Trials

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²⁰⁵	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?	✓	
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?	✓	
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?	✓	
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²⁰⁴ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²⁰⁵ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X

Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²⁰⁶

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Geocaching

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?	✓	
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?	✓	
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²⁰⁷	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²⁰⁶ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²⁰⁷ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X

Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²⁰⁸

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Hang Gliding

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?	✓	
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?	✓	
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²⁰⁹	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(I) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?	✓	

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²⁰⁸ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²⁰⁹ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____ No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²¹⁰

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Foot Travel (Hiking, Jogging)

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²¹¹	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²¹⁰ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²¹¹ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____ No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate ____ Appropriate X

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²¹²

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Horseback Riding, Roads and Designated Trails

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²¹³	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²¹² This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²¹³ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate ____

Appropriate X

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²¹⁴

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Horseback Riding, Cross-country

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²¹⁵	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?	✓	
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?	✓	
(i) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²¹⁴ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²¹⁵ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate X

Appropriate ____

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.

Finding of Appropriateness of a Use on the Monument²¹⁶

Refuge Name: Hanford Reach National Monument

Use: Research and Management Studies

Decision Criteria	NO	YES
(a) Do we have jurisdiction over the use?		✓
(b) Does the use comply with applicable laws and regulations (federal, state, tribal and local)?		✓
(c) Is the use consistent with applicable Executive Orders and Departmental and FWS policies?		✓
(d) Is the use consistent with public safety?		✓
(e) Is the use consistent with goals and objectives in an approved management plan or other document? ²¹⁷	✓	
(f) Has an earlier documented analysis not denied the use, or is this the first time the use has been proposed?		✓
(g) Will this be manageable in the future with available budget and staff?		✓
(h) Is the use manageable in the future with existing resources?		✓
(I) Does the use contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of the Monument's natural or cultural resources, or is the use beneficial to those resources?		✓
(j) Can the use be accommodated without impairing existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses or reducing the potential to provide quality (see Section 1.6D of 603 FW 1 for a description), compatible, wildlife-dependent recreation into the future?		✓

Where the FWS does not have jurisdiction over the use (i.e., “no” to (a)), there is no need to evaluate the use further as the FWS cannot control the use. Uses that are illegal, inconsistent with existing policy, or unsafe (i.e., “no” to (b), (c), or (d)) may not be found appropriate. If the answer is “no” to any of the other questions above (i.e., (e) - (j)), the FWS will **generally** not allow the use.

²¹⁶ This form is not required for wildlife-dependent recreational uses, take regulated by the state of Washington, or uses already described in a CCP or step-down management plan approved after October 9, 1997.

²¹⁷ The Monument was created in June of 2000 and has never had a management plan. This CCP will be the Monument's first management plan, so this standard is not really applicable at this point.

If indicated, the Monument Manager has consulted with the state fish and wildlife agencies.

Yes ____

No X

When the Monument Manager finds the use appropriate based on sound professional judgement, the Monument Manager must justify the use in writing on an attached sheet and obtain the Refuge Supervisor's concurrence.

Based on an overall assessment of these factors, my summary conclusion is the proposed use is:

Not Appropriate ____

Appropriate X

Monument Project Leader: _____
(Signature and Date)

If found to be **Not Appropriate**, the Monument Manager does not need to sign concurrence if the use is a new use.

If an existing use is found **Not Appropriate** outside of the CCP process, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

If found to be **Appropriate**, the Refuge Supervisor must sign concurrence.

Refuge Supervisor: _____
(Signature and Date)

A Compatibility Determination is required before the use may be allowed.